

**REMARKS**

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful examination of this case. Reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested in view of the instant remarks.

The Applicant agrees with the Office Action Summary as set out on page 1 of the Office Action.

With regard to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 - 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ohnishi et al (US Patent No. 4293202). The Examiner's position as stated in paragraph 2 of the Office Action is as follows.

With respect to claim 1, Ohnishi et al discloses a first light source (Figure 1, element 1), a primary spatial light modulator (Figure 1, connected to driver 30) for modulating light from the first source (1), a second light source (Figure 1, element 5), optical means (Figure 1, element 4) for combining light from the second light source (5) with the modulated light from the primary spatial light modulator, and an auxiliary spatial light modulator (Figure 1, rotary multi-mirror (8) and

galvanometer (11)) for modulating the combined light from the optical means (Figure 1, col. 2, line 38 - col. 3, line 8).

The first light source disclosed by Ohnishi et al is a laser beam light source, for example an argon ion laser beam light source which emits a blue or green laser beam (col. 2, lines 38 - 39).

It is respectfully noted that the optical modulator disclosed by Ohnishi et al and which is controlled by the optical modulator driver (30) is not a spatial light modulator as required by the Applicant's claim 1. More specifically, the optical modulator disclosed by Ohnishi et al is not a spatial light modulator because the Ohnishi et al optical modulator only modulates the intensity of the first light source in the form of the single laser beam.

The Ohnishi et al second light source is also a laser beam light source (col. 2, lines 44 - 47). This is also a single laser beam which is described as the reading laser beam. The modulated light from the first light source (ie. the first laser beam) and the light from the second light source (ie. the second laser beam) are combined via the dichroic mirror (4) (col. 2, lines 50 - 52). The combined laser beams are then applied to the reflecting surfaces of the multi-mirror (8). The combined beam is not modulated by the multi-mirror (8). The combined beam is not spatially modulated, nor does the combined beam undergo any intensity modulation.

In Ohnishi et al, the combined beam is only re-directed by the multi-mirror (8). In Ohnishi et al, the combined beam is reflected by the multiple mirror surfaces of the multi-mirror (8) as the multi-mirror (8) rotates. The mirrors of the multi-mirror (8) do not modulate the intensity of the combined beam. The multi-mirror (8) is used to deflect the combined beam, see Ohnishi et al col. 3, lines 1 – 3 where it states:

"..... the combined laser beams 2 and 6 are subjected to a horizontal deflection by a reflecting surface 9 of the rotary multi-mirror 8, ....."

Thus, in Ohnishi et al, the rotary multi-mirror (8) does not modulate the light but only reflects the light in one direction which is the direction of rotation of the multi-mirror (8).

It will be appreciated from the above that Ohnishi et al does not disclose image display apparatus having the features in the Applicant's claim 1. Ohnishi et al does not disclose a spatial light modulator for modulating a first light source, and a second (ie. auxiliary) spatial light modulator for modulating the combined light from the second light source and the modulated first light source. Ohnishi et al does not disclose spatial light modulators with only the first laser beam being modulated. In the Ohnishi et al invention, the second laser beam from the second light source does not

undergo any modulation, and it is only reflected by the mirrors of the multi-mirror (8) to provide a raster pattern.

With regard to paragraph 2 of the Office Action and the Examiner's comments with regard to the Applicant's claims 3, 4 and 8, it is noted that the Examiner refers to a previously cited patent of Roddy and we think that the Examiner may be referring to Ohnishi et al. In any event, the Applicant relies for patentability of claims 3, 4 and 8 on the fact that these claims include all of the features of the Applicant's claim 1, and claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.

Also with regard to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, where the Examiner has objected to the Applicant's claim 5 in view of the Ohnishi et al disclosure of emitted light at different wavelengths, the Applicant relies for patentability of claim 5 on the fact that claim 5 includes all of the features of the Applicant's claim 1, and claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.

With regard to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 6 over Ohnishi et al as applied to claim 1, in view of Roddy et al (US Patent No. 6762785 B2). The Applicant relies for the patentability of claims 2 and 6 on the fact that these claims include all of the features of the Applicant's claim 1, and claim 1 is believed to be allowable for

the reasons stated above. If Ohnishi et al and Roddy et al are combined, then the combined disclosure does not disclose the Applicant's claims 2 and 6 because Ohnishi et al fails to disclose the Applicant's claim 1 for the reasons specified above.

With regard to paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 7 as being unpatentable over Ohnishi et al as applied to claim 1, in view of Ohara et al (US Patent No. 4535342). The Applicant relies for the patentability of claim 7 on the fact that claim 7 includes all of the features of the Applicant's claim 1, and claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons set out above. If Ohnishi et al and Ohara et al are combined, then the combination does not achieve what is set out in the Applicant's claim 7 due to the fact that Ohnishi et al does not disclose the Applicant's claim 1 for the reasons set out above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this **RESPONSE** is found to be **INCOMPLETE**, or if at any time it appears that a **TELEPHONE CONFERENCE** with Counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or one of his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "T. Thompson", written over a horizontal line.

Thomas, E. Thompson, Jr.  
Reg. No. 47,136